DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 451 JC 750 080

AUTHOR Rawson, Janice Claire
TITLE The Development and Evaluation of Behavioral Objectives for Junior College Instruction About Mass Communications.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 34p.; Summary of Master's Thesis, California State University, Fullerton

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Behavioral Objectives; Broadcast Industry; Communications; *Course Content; Course Objectives; Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; Curriculum Planning; *Formative Evaluation; *Junior Colleges; *Mass Media; News Media

ABSTRACT

The lack of agreement among professionals on the objectives or content appropriate for courses about the mass media prompted the development, validation, and ranking of a collection of behavioral objectives for instruction about mass communications. Following the initial steps in Ralph Tyler's "rationale" for curriculum development, a pool of 120 instructional objectives was generated, reviewed against Benjamin Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives, and subsequently rated by a selected 85-member nationwide jury of subject experts. Jury members judged each objective on its relative value to the average citizen-media consumer. The 64 objectives meeting all established criteria indicate professional support for instruction leading to understanding of such concepts as "Freedom of the Press" and "The Public's Right to Know." The jury generally rejected objectives dealing with media history, films, and entertainment and favored instruction focused on the major profit-oriented information media, their characteristics, functions, problems, and responsibilities. The document includes the names of the jury members and personal data supplied by them, a list of all 120 proposed objectives, a ranked set of the approved objectives, and a summary of the rating results. (Author/DC)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE INSTRUCTION ABOUT MASS COMMUNICATIONS

(Summary of)
A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University. Fullerton

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

Communications

By

Janice Claire Rawson

September 1973

JC 750 080

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Contents*

Summary Page Numbers

I Statement of the Problem . . . . . (1)
- Scope and Limitations of Project . . . . .
- Definition of Terms . . . . .
- Assumptions . . . . .
- Organization of Report . . . . .

II Review of Related Literature . . . . .
- Curriculum Development and Evaluation . . . . .
- The General Education Goals of the Junior or Community College . . . . .
- Mass Communication Education and Objectives . . . . .
- Project Development Methods and Procedures . . . . .

III Significance of the Project . . . . .

IV Methods and Procedures . . . . . (2)
- Development of the Pool of Objectives . . . . .
- Evaluation of the Objectives . . . . .
- Editing, Coding, and Analysis of the Data . . . . .

V Findings . . . . . (4)
- Response to Survey . . . . .
- Results of Ratings . . . . .

VI Conclusions and Recommendations . . . . . (10)

References . . . . .

Appendices
- A Documents and Literature Used in Developing Content Outline and Pool of Objectives . . . . .
- B Schools and Organizations Asked to Nominate Subject Experts for Jury . . . . .
- C Materials Used to Gather Data . . . . .
- D Ranked Set of Objectives Meeting Established Acceptance Levels With Summary of Rating Results (partial) . . . . . (15-29)
- E Subject Experts Who Participated in the Rating of Objectives . . . . . (30-31)

Tables

1 Acceptance Levels for Ratings of Objectives Included in Survey . . . . . (4)
2 Summary of Personal Information Supplied by Jury . . . . . (5)
3 Summary of Professional Data Supplied by Jury . . . . . (6)
4 Rank Order of Objectives Based on Medians of Ratings and Interquartile Range (Q Value) . . . . . (7-9)

Illustrations

Figure
1 Two-dimensional chart for checking pool of objectives against content areas and Bloom's taxonomy . . . . .
2 The Rating Scale . . . . . (2)

*The contents reflects the entire report, which is available from University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Mich. The following summary includes only those sections with page references.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE INSTRUCTION ABOUT MASS COMMUNICATIONS

Abstract

The lack of agreement among professionals on the objectives or content appropriate for courses about the mass media prompted the development, validation, and ranking of a collection of behavioral objectives for instruction about mass communications at the junior college.

Following the initial steps in Ralph Tyler's "rationale" for curriculum development, a pool of 120 instructional objectives was generated, reviewed against a taxonomy of educational objectives by Benjamin Bloom, and subsequently rated by a selected 85-member nationwide jury of subject experts. Jury members judged each objective on its relative value to the average citizen-media consumer.

Ratings were recorded on a 7-point (6-0) bipolar graphic rating scale; the median scale value was calculated for each objective and the pool ranked according to median scores. Unreliable or ambiguous objectives were identified by computing the interquartile range (Q) among the ratings for each objective. Objectives were rejected when they did not meet acceptance levels established for median scale values and Q values.

The 64 objectives meeting all established criteria indicate professional support for instruction leading to understanding of such concepts as "Freedom of the Press" and "The Public's Right to Know." The jury generally rejected objectives dealing with media history, films, and entertainment and favored instruction focused on the major profit-oriented information media, their characteristics, functions, problems, and responsibilities.

Statement of the Problem

> Realizing that there is so much to be taught, so much that it would be valuable for people to learn in a complex society such as ours, and so little time to learn, how do we decide what objectives are worth teaching? (Tyler, 1964)

Summary

It was the purpose of this project to develop and validate a collection of behavioral objectives for an introduction to mass communications course suitable for presentation at the junior college. Ratings by a selected nationwide jury of 85 subject matter experts served to identify objectives deemed relatively more important and valuable to the individual student-citizen and to society.

The project, which was intended to be descriptive rather than experimental, was undertaken because of the growing recognition among educators that mass communications has become a legitimate and important subject of formal study for all students and citizens. It is, however, a subject that is extremely broad, and the possibilities relative to content and instruction are numerous and varied; therefore, an essential first step seemed to be to identify just what among the existing--and still growing--body of knowledge,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

skills, and attitudes related to mass communications are most worth teaching and learning.

Methods and Procedures

Guided by Tyler's (1949) "rationale" for curriculum development, the project director generated a pool of 120 possible instructional objectives and submitted them to a nationwide panel of identified subject-matter experts for evaluation. The objectives included in the rating project were drawn from many sources and were in many forms: several already formulated objectives were located in research literature and published collections; the majority, however, were developed from suggested test or discussion questions in field textbooks or teacher's manuals.

Subject specialists were selected for the initial screening of objectives because they were assumed to be best qualified to assess the relative importance of the different areas of content that could be included in an instructional program about mass communications. And determining the content and what the student will be able to do with respect to that content is the first step in a rigorous series of investigations needed to produce a program of instruction that is both possible to teach and worthy of being taught. It was toward the latter problem--determining the relative worth of proposed instructional objectives--that the judges were invited to direct their attention and share their expertise. The panel members were asked to assess the generated objectives in terms of their value to the average citizen and media consumer.

Evaluation of this type--conducted during the development of a curriculum--has been termed "formative" evaluation. Such enroute assessment can provide feedback and correctives at any stage in the development of instruction or the teaching-learning process. But the initial evaluation of instructional objectives--the components upon which all other curriculum, instructional, and evaluation decisions should be based--seemed of primary importance.

A modification of Thurstone's (Thurstone & Chave, 1929) procedures for attitude scale construction was adopted for both gathering and analyzing evaluation data. The subject experts, who were nominated by administrators in schools, professional associations, and agencies known to be involved or interested in mass communications research, were asked to rate each of the 120 objectives on a 7-point bipolar graphic scale. The intervals on the continuum were labeled 6-0 and the respective ends of the scale were identified "Valuable" and "Worthless."

In addition, the judges were asked to give supplementary ratings or qualifying information when appropriate; a check-list form and space for comments was appended to the interval rating scale presented opposite each objective in the rating booklet.

Valuable ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Worthless
6 5 4 2 1 0

___Ambiguous _____Not qualified to judge

___Too elementary ___Too complex ___ Other:

_____

The Rating Scale

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The check list and comment space provided a convenient means of explanation for those judges who had reservations about evaluating an objective statement on the continuum. This supplementary portion of the rating instrument included a "Not qualified to judge" category as a version of the frequently used "Don't know" or "No Opportunity to Observe" answer, which provides an out for the serious rater who does not want to register an opinion in one of the other categories. Additional check points were provided to indicate when an objective was "Ambiguous," "Too Elementary," "Too Complex," or "Other." The judges were asked to explain the latter. The check-list categories were suggested by the project director's own reaction to the pool of objectives, and they were subsequently endorsed by pretest judges:

In developing the pool it became frustratingly clear that questions or objectives often become incomprehensible or misunderstood when taken out of context, away from the instructional unit, reading assignment, or lecture where they are explained or discussed. The "Ambiguous" category was provided for such problem objectives. The "Too Elementary" and "Too Complex" categories allowed for an objective that might be judged valuable but more appropriate either for high school instruction or study by advanced students of communications.

Furthermore, the project director recognized the possibility that some of the judges would be unfamiliar with--and perhaps confused by--the structure of behavioral objectives; other participants might be trained to demand more precise statements than were provided. The check-list was designed to absorb those responses that might--for any of these reasons--tend to distort the scale ratings.

The data analysis--a straightforward scaling procedure suggested by Thurstone's (1929) equal-appearing interval methods--called for rank ordering all objectives according to the median of ratings distributed over the response categories. Using the median rather than the mean eliminates the possibility that ratings in the extreme categories might distort the overall rating of any one objective and preserves the capability of the scale for measuring both the direction and intensity of the judges' feelings toward each objective. The median scale value assigned to each objective in the final set represents a consensual position for the objective according to the particular group of judges rating the objectives on the continuum.

Also following Thurstone's analysis techniques, the variance over the judges' ratings on all objectives was specified in terms of the interquartile range or Q value. Thurstone regarded a large Q value--indicating a large variance--primarily as an indication that a statement is ambiguous or demonstrates lack of agreement among judges. Both the Q value and the scale value for each statement were considered in the final ranking.

Acceptance levels were based on the principle that the higher median scale values might tolerate greater variance among judges. Thus, larger Q values were deemed acceptable for the higher median scale ratings than for the lower median ratings. In addition, because the purpose of the project

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

was to identify those objectives rated as more valuable, all objectives with a median scale value of less than 3.50 were rejected irrespective of Q value, and any objective with a Q value of more than 2.50 was rejected irrespective of median scale value.

Objectives receiving median scale ratings and Q values above the minimum criteria were evaluated on a sliding scale wherein the higher median ratings were accepted only with lower Q values. The acceptance levels in Table 1 guided the inclusion or rejection of objectives rated and ranked for this project.

TABLE 1

Acceptance Levels for Ratings of Objectives Included in Survey

Median Scale Values	Maximum Q Value
5.00 - 5.49	2.50
4.50 - 4.99	2.25
4.00 - 4.49	2.00
3.50 - 3.99	1.75

Only the responses on the 7-point interval rating scale were considered in computing the median scale value and the Q value for any objective. However, any objective that was rated on the check list as ambiguous by more than 10% of the jury was eliminated from the list of accepted objectives. Other check-list ratings did not influence the acceptance of objectives if they met all established criteria.

Findings

Response to Survey

Of the 160 potential judges who were nominated and subsequently mailed two copies of the rating booklet, 104 individuals, or 65% of those polled, responded. However, only 85 of these, representing 53% of those invited to participate, returned completed rating books and were designated as the jury of experts (see Appendex E). The remaining 19 respondents acknowledged receipt of the rating books but declined to participate for various reasons: two books were returned incomplete without names; eight nominees cited lack of time; one was out of the country and his secretary returned the books; two potential judges disqualified themselves--one because he had not taught a consumer course, the other because he did not consider himself a mass communications expert; three nominees declined because they questioned the method or validity of the survey or questions; one nominee wanted verification that the survey was a valid graduate project; two declined to participate for other reasons but did make several recommendations regarding content and what they felt should be the general goals and emphasis of a consumer course about the mass media.

The nominating process and the personal and professional information supplied by the judges--as well as the explanations given by some of the nominees who declined to participate--indicates that the individuals identified

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

as the jury members for this project can be legitimately designated as mass communications experts. Education levels were generally high (see Table 2), and several of the judges specified more than 50 years experience in mass communications fields; only one judge listed less than two years of experience. Total years of professional experience reported by all participants was 2,277 or an average of 26.8 years per judge. However, the data relating to the question of experience were confounded by indications--either stated or inferred by the project director--that part-time work had been included in several judges' responses. The validity of the totals is, therefore, suspect, and they were deleted from the tabular summary of professional data supplied by jury members.

If the number of females on the panel of experts is an accurate reflection of their status among mass communications professionals, the women still have a long way to go. Of the more than 180 nominations received (before duplicates were eliminated), only 12 were women. Seven of these participated, and two others responded with regrets that they did not have time to complete the rating.

Twenty-seven states were represented on the final panel, and although there appeared to be a concentration in the mid-east or great lakes areas, the jury was otherwise distributed fairly evenly throughout the United States.

The interdisciplinary nature of mass communications was evident in the judges' response to questions about their professional experience; in listing both their major subject area(s) and in specifying their present role, the majority listed more than one subject and frequently checked several roles. Subjects in which the jury members indicated specialization were edited into 15 general groups (see Table 3). When more than one subject area was specified, the first one listed guided the coding.

Although asked to specify the one professional role--researcher, educator, or practitioner--that was most appropriate, many checked more than one.

TABLE 2

Summary of Personal Information Supplied by Jury

Group	Number	Percentage
Sex		
Male	78	91.8
Female	7	8.2
Age		
20-30	5	5.9
31-40	20	23.5
41-50	21	24.7
51-60	21	24.7
61+	18	21.2
Highest Degree Held		
Bachelor's	9	10.6
Master's	28	32.9
Doctorate	46	54.1
No Response	2	2.4
Introduction to Mass Communications Teaching Experience		
Has taught course for majors	61	71.6
Has taught course for non majors	46	54.1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3

Summary of Professional Data Supplied by Jury

Major Subject Area	Number of Judges	Percentage	Role						
			Researcher	Educator	Practitioner	Researcher/ Educator	Researcher/ Practitioner	Educator/ Practitioner	Researcher/ Educator/ Practitioner
Advertising	6	7.1	1	3	1	0	0	1	0
Economics	5	5.9	1	2	0	1	0	1	0
Public Relations	1	1.2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Journalism	21	24.7	0	10	6	2	1	1	1
English	2	2.4	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Education	5	5.9	0	3	0	1	0	1	0
Press & Society/ Mass Communications	18	21.1	2	9	0	5	0	2	0
Speech Communication	3	3.5	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
Broadcast Journalism	5	5.9	1	1	3	0	0	0	0
Political Science	4	4.7	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Law	1	1.2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Social Research	7	8.2	3	3	0	0	0	0	1
History of Media	3	3.5	0	2	0	0	0	1	0
Psychology-Sociology	1	1.2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Industrial Journalism	3	3.5	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Total	85	100	8	39	16	11	1	8	2
Percentage			9.4	45.9	18.8	12.9	1.2	9.4	2.4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Results of Ratings

Computer tabulation and analysis of all rating results and ranking of objectives shows that 64 of the pool of 120 objectives rated meet all established acceptance criteria.

The number of judges rating the different objectives on the scale ranged from a low of 48 (56.4%), for a single objective, (No. 83) to a high of 82 (96.4%), which was the number of judges rating three objectives (No's. 52, 60, and 119) on the interval rating scale. An average of 74 judges rated each of the 120 objectives on the scale, thus contributing to the ranking of the entire pool and the identification of those objectives which are relatively more valuable.

Median scale values ranged from a low of 1.38 to a high of 5.26 within a possible range of 0-6. Q values ranged from .99 to 3.55, reflecting the relative agreement or disagreement among the judges in their ratings of any given objective.

Eighty-four objectives had median scale ratings above the minimum acceptable value of 3.50, but 20 of these were rejected because of ambiguity or lack of agreement among judges as indicated by high Q values. The ranked list of the entire pool of objectives appears as Table 4. Objectives not meeting all criteria for acceptance are indicated with an asterisk.

TABLE 4

Rank Order of Objectives Based on Medians of Ratings and Interquartile Range (Q Value)[a]

Rank	Objective Number	No. Judges Rating Objt. On Scale	Median Scale Value	Q Value	Maximum Q Value[b]	Check List Ratings Over 7% (Percentages)[c]				
						A	NQ	E	C	O
1	7	81	5.26	0.99						
2	37	69	5.09	1.46	2.50					
3	21	75	4.96	1.79	2.25				8	
4	4	72	4.82	1.85				9		
5	64	78	4.75	1.34						
6	8	75	4.74	1.28						
7	52	71	4.56	1.49					10	
8	56	80	4.50	1.97	2.25					
9	55	77	4.48	1.78	2.00					
10	24	79	4.46	1.54						
11	53	73	4.44	1.61					11	
12	40	66	4.43	1.63					14	
13	96	79	4.42	1.61						
14	19	73	4.41	1.46						
15	12	77	4.41	1.65						

Note.--Starred objectives do not meet all criteria for acceptance; Median Scale Values and Q Values in parentheses fall outside acceptance limits.

[a] Interquartile Range (Q Value) = middle 50% of responses on scale.

[b] Established acceptance levels for ratings on scale; high Q Value indicates lack of agreement among judges.

[c] A = Ambiguous; NQ = Not Qualified to judge; E = Too Elementary; C = Too Complex; O = Other on check list. Frequent entries in any check-list category suggest problem with objective and help identify difficulty.

TABLE 4--Continued

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Rank	Objective Number	No. Judges Rating Objt. On Scale	Median Scale Value	Q Value	Maximum Q Value	Check List Ratings Over 7% (Percentages) A	NQ	E	C	O
16	25	70	4.41	1.92					6	
17	69	70	4.40	1.93		8				9
18	107	80	4.36	1.72						
19	81	76	4.35	1.98						
20	11	74	4.33	1.77						
21	49	76	4.32	1.48						
22	43	66	4.32	1.50					18	
23	2	74	4.31	1.48						
24	1	74	4.29	1.62						
25	27*	72	4.26	(2.05)					8	
26	5	74	4.25	1.87						
27	17	77	4.23	1.39						
28	57	73	4.22	1.44						
29	3	79	4.21	1.87						
30	108	76	4.19	1.33						
31	23	77	4.19	1.34						
32	71	69	4.19	1.66					8	
33	73	76	4.17	1.54						
34	36	75	4.17	1.61					8	
35	9	81	4.17	1.79						
36	114	75	4.15	1.65						
37	29	75	4.11	1.39						
38	45	54	4.10	1.87			20		11	
39	79	78	4.08	1.56						
40	67	77	4.08	1.89						
41	54	65	4.07	1.66					21	
42	117	79	4.02	1.63						
43	109	78	4.00	1.76						
44	94	76	4.00	1.86					8	
45	102*	74	4.00	(3.34)[d]	2.00 ▲					
46	6	68	3.95	1.66	1.75 ▼				14	
47	113	74	3.95	1.67					8	
48	120*	73	3.93	(1.82)					9	
49	13*	69	3.93	(2.07)				14		
50	110	79	3.92	1.70						
51	59*	73	3.92	(1.82)					8	
52	118	82	3.90	1.51						
53	116	79	3.89	1.47						
54	14	78	3.89	1.55						
55	99*	69	3.87	(2.23)					10	
56	28*	73	3.86	(2.83)					11	
57	100	72	3.84	1.70					9	
58	51	79	3.83	1.68						
59	35*	75	3.83	(1.87)						
60	85	82	3.82	1.38						
61	22	76	3.81	1.75						
62	88*	76	3.78	(2.24)						
63	46	79	3.77	1.59						
64	68	64	3.77	1.69						
65	91*	70	3.76	(2.35)					12	
66	106	78	3.75	1.54					8	
67	80	72	3.75	1.63						
68	78	72	3.72	1.73						
69	60*	71	3.72	(3.55)						
70	70	73	3.70	1.35					8	

[d]Procedural objective which apparently confounded judges.

TABLE 4--Continued

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Rank	Objective Number	No. Judges Rating Objt. On Scale	Median Scale Value	Q Value	Maximum Q Value	Check List Ratings Over 7% (Percentages)				
						A	B	E	C	D
71	10	78	3.70	1.42						
72	63*	79	3.69	(2.26)						
73	26	78	3.68	1.55						
74	98*	80	3.67	(1.92)						
75	90*	80	3.67	(1.98)						
76	65	78	3.66	1.45						
77	75*	78	3.64	(2.36)						
78	92*	81	3.63	(2.64)						
79	33*	68	3.60	(1.84)						
80	97	76	3.58	1.69						
81	42	78	3.57	1.29						
82	20*	76	3.56	(2.28)						
83	93*	75	3.54	(2.57)						
84	76*	68	3.54	(2.60)	1.75					
85	89*	77	(3.48)	(2.24)	1.50					
86	66*	75	(3.44)	(2.53)						
87	86*	78	(3.44)	(3.12)						
88	104*	73	(3.43)	(2.45)					9	
89	101*	58	(3.42)	(3.27)					21	
90	119*	76	(3.40)	(2.41)						
91	30*	74	(3.33)	(2.58)						
92	34*	72	(3.30)	(2.79)						
93	41*	64	(3.29)	(2.46)		10			11	
94	61*	66	(3.27)	(3.23)				11	8	
95	50*	72	(3.26)	(2.13)						
96	58*	67	(3.24)	(2.62)					15	
97	38*	73	(3.21)	(2.69)						
98	105*	76	(3.19)	(2.57)						
99	31*	75	(3.16)	(2.37)	1.50					
100	77*	57	(3.12)	(2.96)			10		11	
101	72*	81	(3.11)	(2.35)						
102	15*	66	(3.00)	(2.85)			8			
103	62*	73	(2.90)	(3.41)						
104	32*	81	(2.81)	(2.49)						
105	74*	72	(2.75)	(2.32)					8	
106	16*	78	(2.70)	(2.42)						
107	39*	75	(2.58)	(2.13)						
108	111*	75	(2.32)	(2.60)						
109	44*	63	(2.10)	(2.41)					12	
110	87*	76	(2.00)	(2.63)						
111	83*	48	(2.00)	(3.57)			15		22	
112	82*	75	(1.92)	(2.60)						
113	95*	76	(1.82)	(2.64)						
114	115*	81	(1.74)	(2.73)						
115	84*	79	(1.67)	(2.60)						
116	103*	80	(1.64)	(2.57)						
117	112*	77	(1.61)	(2.76)						
118	18*	77	(1.57)	(2.75)				9		
119	48*	82	(1.46)	(2.06)						
120	47*	74	(1.38)	(2.09)						

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Conclusions and Recommendations

Rating results and information provided by the participating judges supports the assumption that judges would rate certain topics, concepts, and ideas related to mass communications as more valuable than others. (See example of Appendix D - the ranked set of objective statements meeting established acceptance levels and a tabulation of judges' responses.)

In addition to identifying objectives considered relatively more important and valuable to the individual student-citizen and to society, the judges' use of the check list and their comments on the project, pool or individual objectives makes it possible to draw several conclusions about topics and general areas of relatively valuable course content as well as other aspects of the field of mass communications.

The jury apparently agrees the average media consumer-citizen should understand the rationale underlying the constitutional guarantee of a free press and be acquainted with the social responsibility philosophy of modern journalism. Objectives ranked #1, #2, #5, and #11 all deal with the "Public's Right to Know" concept

The characteristics that the major media have in common and their advantages and limitations are also considered important according to the tabulated rating results. The judges ranked as #3 an objective requiring the student to describe the similarities of the major mass media and the unique characteristics, operation, and primary function of each medium, as well as the different content and audiences of the major media.

The citizen's responsibility in keeping informed about public affairs is emphasized in the objective ranked #4. The rating results also indicate strong support for clarification of the business aspect of the mass media. Objectives ranked #6 and #10 deal with the economic foundation of the major systems of mass communication and the fact the media are primarily profit-oriented operations.

The adversary relationship between the press and government is another topic the judges apparently feel the average citizen needs to understand--along with the ways public opinion affects and is affected by the mass media (see objectives ranked #15, #17, #7, and #12).

Objectives dealing with films, music, comics, and propaganda, which are given considerable emphasis in some text books and some courses, did not rate with the particular panel judging this collection of objectives. Nor did the jury consider history to be as important as recent events, current problems, and criticism of the media.

Objectives dealing with the theories of Marshall McLuhan were considered either "Too complex" or "Worthless." One judge was prompted to comment "Who can explain McLuhan?" Many of the judges believed the collection on the whole to be too complex for the average media consumer. Also, considering the panel members were all identified as subject experts, an unusually high number of the judges suggested they were unfamiliar with several areas of content which, along with many of the topics judged to be too complex, receive

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sometimes substantial attention in current textbooks advertised as appropriate for media survey courses designed for consumers. Jerome Barron's proposal for public access to the media, for example, perplexed many judges (see Objective No. 45, Rank #38): Seventeen judges (20%) indicated they were not qualified to judge this objective.

Although the bulk of the objectives were deliberately written at the higher levels of the taxonomy and the pool as a whole was judged to be too complex for the average consumer, there is little evidence that the level at which the objectives were written significantly affected the ratings. A number of the objectives asking only for the student to "list" or "describe" were judged "Too complex" by a number of judges, (and one judge merely objected to "too many lists"); several other objectives calling for higher levels of behavior were considered "Too elementary." One objective (No. 61, Rank #94) was rated both "Too elementary" and "Too complex" by at least 10% of the panel.

The extent of the judges' focus on content rather than the level, form or specificity of the statements is illustrated by an examination of the objectives ranked #1 (Objective No. 7) and #2 (Objective No. 37). The top-ranked objective statement is specific and the second ranked objective, which deals with the same concept and subject matter--freedom of the press and the public's right to know--is deliberately general and biased. Although the Q value is higher for Objective No. 37, the scale value indicates the judges were consistent in evaluating content. The comments on Objective No. 37 suggests more concern with the bias and slant of the statement than the non-behavioral terminology. Comments included: "Debatable premise," "It's freedom of speech that belongs to public," "Indoctrination," "Freedom of the Press is the right of individual, not public."

Further consistency in the rating of content is evident in comparing the two objectives dealing with the adversary relationship between the press and the government: The objective which judges ranked #15 (Objective No. 12) is stated in terms of student performance, but the objective ranked #17 (Objective No. 69) calls for the student to "understand" that the adversary situation is healthy. Again there was considerable concern about the bias of the statement. Several of the judges edited the statement and/or commented; remarks include: "Editorial," "Too much of an assumption," "Question validity of conclusion," "Questionable premise," and "Not in behavioral terms." One judge circled the word understand in both Objective No. 37 and Objective No. 69 and checked them "Ambiguous." He was the only judge reacting consistently to these two"general"objectives. It is interesting, too, that he is a practitioner--an editor in the industrial field--rather than an educator. The judge noting that Objective No. 69 was not in behavioral terms rated No. 37 as "Too elementary."

In both of the above cases the specific objective had a much lower Q value and comparatively little stated suggestion that the objective was ambiguous. The median scale value, the Q value, and the ultimate rank of the objectives were determined only by those judges rating on the scale. There

were 12 more judges rating No. 7 and seven more rating No. 12 than rated their biased and generally-stated partners. And it seems unlikely that the one objective of the pair would have influenced the reaction to the other since they were so widely separated in the rating order.

The only other objective not stated in terms of student learning was a procedural objective (No. 102), which ranked #45. The median scale value was 4.0--well within the acceptance limits, but it was rejected because of a very high Q value, indicating lack of agreement among the judges. Several who rated it high amplified their rating with favorable comments relating to its validity and usefulness as an instructional aid; other commented that it offered no benefit to the student and marked it "Worthless." An inference that might be drawn from the judges' reaction to this objective is that the jury was indeed considering quite seriously the value of each objective in terms of the average media consumer and that the behavioral aspect of objectives was not totally ignored. While one jury member noted that he was handicapped by the lack of criterion for measuring performance, another judge commented:

> Many of the subject areas are important to any citizen, but I hope the verbiage in which they are presented is popularized before students are exposed to it. I realize that precision is important in your question phrasing, but the questions in this form make communications sound terribly dull.

There was frequent reference to the number of objectives and the scope of the material represented in the pool. More than a dozen judges questioned how it would be possible to cover all the content areas in a single course. It was, of course, the scope of the subject and the need to identify those subject areas and student behaviors that are relatively more important that prompted this project.

Comments that could not be coded into one of the other categories on the check list fell into several areas. Often they merely amplified or supplemented a judge's rating or classification of an objective. Many judges indicated as "Ambiguous" statements that included more than one objective or specified performance in several unrelated ways. In most cases the dual objectives clearly should have been separated; however, some statements referred to required prerequisite skills.

Perhaps the most consistent reaction was to those objectives which were biased or slanted, often by a single absolute term or evaluative word. With few exceptions, the bias was not intended, and it was invariably caught by several of the jury members.

This project was an attempt at but the first of several clearly specified steps in the design of a curriculum. Enthusiasm for proceeding with the development of such a program of study is suggested by the comments as well as the participation of the jury of experts who rated objectives for this project. Response from the experts recommended for jury service was proportionally higher than from the group asked merely to nominate experts: 53% of the subject experts invited to participate responded with completed rating booklets; only 35% of the administrators in agencies or associations asked to provide names

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

did so; 43% of the journalism school administrators submitted recommendations.

Several of the administrators nominating experts for jury service included their own names. Others attested to the caliber and interests of their nominees: the executive secretary of a large professional association nominated five prominent mass communications educators, noting that "all are top-drawer and all are former practitioners. Probably all busy, too, but might be inclined to cooperate on such a project." Four of the five did participate.

Also, considering the length of the schedule (one jury member indicated he spent 15+ hours completing the ratings, and several others mentioned spending several hours), the judges were most encouraging in their response to a request for assistance with a possible extension of this project: 40 jury members--47% of the panel--indicated they would participate in an extension of the project.

A number of judges objected to the length of the schedule, however, and several pointed out what they believed was needless repetition. But more than half of the participants acknowledged the value and importance of the project or noted the comprehensiveness of the pool of objectives. Only three of the participating judges listed content areas they felt had been neglected in the pool: one jury member encouraged more attention to the suburban press and how it covers--or does not cover--such current social problems as transportation, ecology, and drugs. Another judge suggested students could be made more aware of the career possibilities and problems of industrial journalism. A third subject expert noted that all the objectives in the pool were important, and he would further complicate the problem of too much content by asking students to actually write a news story, editorial, and/or broadcast script (as was called for in one of the objectives), so they would get a better feel for the actual work and problems of news reporters.

While not completing the rating booklet, Joseph Klapper of CBS reviewed the objectives and offered other recommendations (personal correspondence, May 8, 1972): He did not believe the pool of objectives sufficiently treated the relationship between local television stations and networks; he suggested that a student completing a course based on the pool of objectives submitted for rating

> would not know what a television network actually is and, more importantly (since most people do not understand it) what it is not, nor would he know anything about the degree of freedom which can be exercized by an independent television station affiliated with a network in regard to the programming it beams to its own community.

The jury responses generally were consistent with Klapper's suggestion that media consumers should be helped to "understand how the mass media actually function in today's world and/or what the media may be realistically expected to do and how they may be influenced toward doing it." Klapper noted that students should be made aware of "the functions, good or bad, which the media actually serve in the lives of most people." He also suggested that the media consumer completing the course should know what population groups go to movies a great deal, those that do not, and how this affects the content of

movies. Likewise, the student should know what sections of newspapers are widely read and what sections are largely ignored.

While certain deficiencies of the project have become evident, many unexpected and valuable results have also been noted. Several participants included exclamatory remarks to the effect that the rating project really forced them to think about what they were doing, and many of the objectives called for hard decisions. The project director also received numerous notes and several separate letters indicating that the project prompted a reevaluation of existing programs in the schools where jury members teach. Practitioners, too, commented that they were made to think about what they were doing. The survey also has led to the exchange of course outlines and instructional material with several judges. The method and format of the data gathering instrument also drew praise: one judge noted it was "best of type" he had seen.

The project was intended as the first step in a rigorous series of investigations needed to produce a program of instruction that is both possible to teach and worthy of being taught. To complete the review of objectives suggested by Tyler (1949), the statements endorsed by subject experts should now be screened to see how well they match the needs and interests of students and perhaps members of the community. The 64 accepted objectives might also be submitted to educators who are experts in general education to see how well they would, in their opinion, serve the goals of general education. The validated objectives might also be useful in developing accountability or articulation standards.

There are numerous other possibilities for further research: refinement of the pool of objectives, for example, by determining the actual level of learning represented by those objectives meeting established criteria, or replicating the study after the objective statements have been thoroughly edited to eliminate bias and reference to more than one objective.

The sequence of steps recommended by Tyler's rationale also remains to be completed to produce a program of instruction about the mass media that will serve the needs of both students and society. Tyler specifies the need for developing classroom activities and experiences to achieve objectives, organizing experiences in the most effective manner, and, finally, developing means of checking whether the objectives are being attained. Of course determining acceptable performance standards is also necessary.

The primary outcome of this project--the validated set of objectives--may serve as a starting point for teachers, curriculum developers, or school administrators not only in junior colleges but also in high schools and four-year schools in building or revising courses introducing students to mass communications.

Ranked Set of Objectives Meeting Established Acceptance Levels
With Summary of Rating Results

RANK #1
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 7)

THE STUDENT WILL EXPLAIN THE RATIONALE BEHIND THE CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEE OF "FREEDOM OF THE PRESS," NOTING ESPECIALLY WHO IS PROTECTED, AND RELATE IT TO THE MODERN NEWS CONCEPT (THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW) AS ADVOCATED BY JOURNALISTS.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	0	0 %
1	1	1 %
2	0	0 %
3	0	0 %
4	9	10 %
5	16	18 %
6	55	64 %
AMBIGUOUS	1	1 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	1	1 %
TOO COMPLEX	2	2 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	0	0 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	0	1	0	0	9	16	55
PERCENTAGE	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	19.8%	67.9%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	12.3%	32.1%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 81

25TH PERCENTILE IS 4.64
50TH PERCENTILE IS 5.26 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.63

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 0.99

RANK #2
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 37)

THE STUDENT WILL UNDERSTAND THAT "FREEDOM OF THE PRESS" IS A RIGHT THAT BELONGS TO THE PUBLIC AND IS NOT MEANT TO PROTECT ONLY THOSE WHO POSSESS THE IMPLEMENTS OF PUBLISHING.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	0	0 %
1	0	0 %
2	5	5 %
3	2	2 %
4	9	10 %
5	15	17 %
6	38	44 %
AMBIGUOUS	5	5 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	6	7 %
TOO COMPLEX	1	1 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	4	4 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	0	0	5	2	9	15	38
PERCENTAGE	0.0%	0.0%	7.2%	2.9%	13.0%	21.7%	55.1%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	0.0%	0.0%	7.2%	10.1%	23.2%	44.9%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 69

25TH PERCENTILE IS 4.08
50TH PERCENTILE IS 5.09 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.55

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.46

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RANK #3
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 21)

THE STUDENT WILL BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE CHARACTERISTICS THAT ARE COMMON TO ALL THE MAJOR MASS MEDIA AND NOTE THE DIFFERENCES AND/OR UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS THAT CAN BE ASSIGNED TO EACH MEDIUM. RESPONSE SHOULD INCLUDE REFERENCE TO PRIMARY FUNCTIONS, CONTENT, OPERATIONS, AUDIENCES, ADVANTAGES, AND LIMITATIONS.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	0	0 %
1	0	0 %
2	3	3 %
3	1	1 %
4	21	24 %
5	13	15 %
6	37	43 %
AMBIGUOUS	2	2 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	7	8 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	1	1 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	0	0	3	1	21	13	37
PERCENTAGE	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	1.3%	28.0%	17.3%	49.3%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	5.3%	33.3%	50.7%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 75

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.70
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.96 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.49

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.79

RANK #4
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 4)

THE STUDENT WILL CONSTRUCT A LIST OF REASONS WHY ALL CITIZENS HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF KEEPING INFORMED ABOUT PUBLIC PROBLEMS AND OF THE ACTIONS TAKEN ON THEM BY THOSE IN PUBLIC OFFICE.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	0	0 %
1	5	5 %
2	5	5 %
3	2	2 %
4	10	11 %
5	17	20 %
6	33	38 %
AMBIGUOUS	2	2 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	8	9 %
TOO COMPLEX	1	1 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	2	2 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	0	5	5	2	10	17	33
PERCENTAGE	0.0%	6.9%	6.9%	2.8%	13.9%	23.6%	45.8%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	0.0%	6.9%	13.9%	16.7%	30.6%	54.2%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 72

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.60
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.82 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.45

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.85

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RANK #5
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 64)

THE STUDENT WILL DISCUSS THE LIMITS THERE ARE ON THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW AND THE IMPLICATIONS THESE MIGHT HAVE FOR THE FUNCTION AND CREDIBILITY OF THE NEWS MEDIA. HE WILL SUPPORT OR ATTACK THE CALL FOR GOVERNMENT SECRECY IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	0	0 %
1	1	1 %
2	1	1 %
3	0	0 %
4	16	18 %
5	28	32 %
6	32	37 %
AMBIGUOUS	2	2 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	4	4 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	1	1 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	0	1	1	0	16	28	32
PERCENTAGE	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	20.5%	35.9%	41.0%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	0.0%	1.3%	2.6%	2.6%	23.1%	59.0%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 78

25TH PERCENTILE IS 4.05
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.75 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.39

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.34

RANK #6
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 8)

THE STUDENT WILL DISCUSS AND COMMENT ON THE CONFLICT BETWEEN A MASS MEDIUM'S FUNCTION AS A QUASI-PUBLIC UTILITY FOR DISPENSING VITAL INFORMATION AND AS A CAPITALISTIC ENTERPRISE SEEKING PROFITS.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	1	1 %
1	1	1 %
2	0	0 %
3	0	0 %
4	14	16 %
5	29	34 %
6	30	35 %
AMBIGUOUS	3	3 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	2	2 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	5	5 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	1	1	0	0	14	25	30
PERCENTAGE	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	18.7%	38.7%	40.0%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	1.3%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	21.3%	60.0%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 75

25TH PERCENTILE IS 4.09
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.74 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.38

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.28

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RANK #7
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 52)

THE STUDENT WILL COMPILE A LIST OF QUESTIONS THAT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN ASSESSING THE VALIDITY OF A PUBLISHED PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY OR POLL RESULTS. HE WILL EVALUATE A PUBLISHED POLL TO DEMONSTRATE HOW ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS REVEAL FALLACIOUS INFORMATION.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	0	0 %
1	0	0 %
2	4	4 %
3	3	3 %
4	14	16 %
5	26	30 %
6	24	28 %
AMBIGUOUS	3	3 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	9	10 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	2	2 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	0	0	4	3	14	26	24
PERCENTAGE	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	4.2%	19.7%	36.6%	33.8%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	9.9%	29.6%	66.2%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 71

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.77
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.56 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.26

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.49

RANK #8
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 56)

THE STUDENT WILL DEFINE "NEWS" AND LIST THE VARIOUS TYPES OF STORIES INCLUDED UNDER THE CATEGORY OF NEWS. HE WILL SUBMIT A CLIPPED EXAMPLE OF EACH, NOTING THE DISTINGUISHING CHARACTERISTICS, ESPECIALLY EXAMPLES OF OBJECTIVITY AND COMMENT OR BIAS IN REPORTING.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	2	2 %
1	3	3 %
2	5	5 %
3	3	3 %
4	18	21 %
5	18	21 %
6	31	36 %
AMBIGUOUS	1	1 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	2	2 %
TOO COMPLEX	1	1 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	1	1 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	2	3	5	3	18	18	31
PERCENTAGE	2.5%	3.8%	6.3%	3.8%	22.5%	22.5%	38.8%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	2.5%	6.3%	12.5%	16.3%	38.8%	61.3%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 80

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.39
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.50 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.35

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.97

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RANK #9
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 55)

THE STUDENT WILL DEFINE LIBEL, DISTINGUISH IT FROM FAIR COMMENT AND CRITICISM (AS WELL AS SLANDER), AND EXPLAIN THE POSSIBLE PENALTIES THAT A PUBLICATION FACES IF IT IS SUCCESSFULLY TRIED FOR LIBEL.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	1	1 %
1	2	2 %
2	4	4 %
3	1	1 %
4	21	24 %
5	20	23 %
6	28	32 %
AMBIGUOUS	2	2 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	5	5 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	1	1 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	1	2	4	1	21	20	28
PERCENTAGE	1.3%	2.6%	5.2%	1.3%	27.3%	26.0%	36.4%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	1.3%	3.9%	9.1%	10.4%	37.7%	63.6%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 77

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.54
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.48 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.31

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.78

RANK #10
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 24)

THE STUDENT WILL OUTLINE THE ECONOMIC FOUNDATION OF EACH OF THE MAJOR MEDIA, NOTING ESPECIALLY THE EXTENT TO WHICH EACH IS DEPENDENT ON ADVERTISING REVENUE AND CONSUMER PAYMENT.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	0	0 %
1	0	0 %
2	4	4 %
3	1	1 %
4	22	25 %
5	27	31 %
6	25	29 %
AMBIGUOUS	1	1 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	1	1 %
TOO COMPLEX	4	4 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	0	0 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	0	0	4	1	22	27	25
PERCENTAGE	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	1.3%	27.8%	34.2%	31.6%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	6.3%	34.2%	68.4%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 79

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.07
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.46 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.21

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.54

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RANK #11
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 53)

THE STUDENT WILL RECALL PUBLICIZED INCIDENTS WHICH REFLECT THE CLASH BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUAL'S RIGHT OF PRIVACY AND THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW. HE WILL SUGGEST GUIDELINES TO JUSTIFY PRINTING OR WITHHOLDING INFORMATION (WHO-WHAT) WHEN SUCH A CLASH DEVELOPS.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	1	1 %
1	0	0 %
2	5	5 %
3	1	1 %
4	19	22 %
5	24	28 %
6	23	27 %
AMBIGUOUS	1	1 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	9	10 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	2	2 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY		0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY		1	0	5	1	19	24	23
PERCENTAGE		1.4%	0.0%	6.8%	1.4%	26.0%	32.9%	31.5%
CUMULATIVE	PERCENTAGE	1.4%	1.4%	8.2%	9.6%	35.6%	68.5%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 73

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.59
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.44 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.21

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.61

RANK #12
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 40)

THE STUDENT WILL EXPLAIN AND DEFEND OR ATTACK THE CONTENTION THAT PUBLIC OPINION HOLDS VERY LITTLE WEIGHT IN THE UNITED STATES. HE WILL DETAIL THE TACTICS AND TECHNIQUES OF PRESSURE GROUPS IN INFLUENCING PUBLIC OPINION, GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, LAWMAKERS, AND THE PRESS.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	0	0 %
1	0	0 %
2	4	4 %
3	2	2 %
4	18	21 %
5	21	24 %
6	21	24 %
AMBIGUOUS	3	3 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	12	14 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	4	4 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY		0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY		0	0	4	2	18	21	21
PERCENTAGE		0.0%	0.0%	6.1%	3.0%	27.3%	31.8%	31.8%
CUMULATIVE	PERCENTAGE	0.0%	0.0%	6.1%	9.1%	36.4%	68.2%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 66

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.58
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.43 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.21

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.63

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RANK #13
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 96)

THE STUDENT WILL DISCUSS THE CONTROVERSY CONCERNING GOVERNMENT SUBPOENA OF REPORTER NOTES, SOURCE IDENTIFICATION, OR TV OUTTAKES, EXPLAINING AND COMMENTING ON RECENT INCIDENTS (I.E., "SELLING OF THE PENTAGON," BLACK PANTHER OR MANSON TRIAL COVERAGE).

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	0	0 %
1	0	0 %
2	4	4 %
3	2	2 %
4	23	27 %
5	25	29 %
6	25	29 %
AMBIGUOUS	0	0 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	5	5 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	1	1 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	0	0	4	2	23	25	25
PERCENTAGE	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	2.5%	29.1%	31.6%	31.6%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	7.6%	36.7%	68.4%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 79

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.60
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.42 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.21

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.61

RANK #14
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 19)

THE STUDENT WILL EXPLAIN AND DISCUSS THE EXISTENCE OF A MONOPOLY PRESS IN THE UNITED STATES TODAY AND COMMENT ON THE CAUSES AND THE VALIDITY OF THE DANGERS.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	0	0 %
1	2	2 %
2	4	4 %
3	1	1 %
4	18	21 %
5	28	32 %
6	20	23 %
AMBIGUOUS	5	5 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	1	1 %
NOT QUALIFIED	1	1 %
OTHER	5	5 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	0	2	4	1	18	28	20
PERCENTAGE	0.0%	2.7%	5.5%	1.4%	24.7%	38.4%	27.4%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	0.0%	2.7%	8.2%	9.6%	34.2%	72.6%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 73

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.63
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.41 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.09

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.46

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RANK #15
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 12)

THE STUDENT WILL EXPLAIN WHAT IS MEANT BY THE ADVERSARY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PRESS AND GOVERNMENT, STATING HIS VIEWS ON THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE ARRANGEMENT.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	1	1 %
1	0	0 %
2	3	3 %
3	2	2 %
4	23	27 %
5	23	27 %
6	25	29 %
AMBIGUOUS	1	1 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	2	2 %
TOO COMPLEX	2	2 %
NOT QUALIFIED	1	1 %
OTHER	2	2 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	1	0	3	2	23	23	25
PERCENTAGE	1.3%	0.0%	3.9%	2.6%	29.9%	29.9%	32.5%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	1.3%	1.3%	5.2%	7.8%	37.7%	67.5%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 77

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.58
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.41 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.23

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.65

RANK #16
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 25)

THE STUDENT WILL EXPLAIN THE SEVERAL ASPECTS OF THE "GATEKEEPER" OPERATION IN THE SELECTION OF NEWS FOR PUBLICATION AND COMPARE TO NEWS MANAGEMENT OPERATION IN GOVERNMENT.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	1	1 %
1	2	2 %
2	7	8 %
3	1	1 %
4	17	20 %
5	17	20 %
6	25	29 %
AMBIGUOUS	5	5 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	7	8 %
NOT QUALIFIED	2	2 %
OTHER	1	1 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	1	2	7	1	17	17	25
PERCENTAGE	1.4%	2.9%	10.0%	1.4%	24.3%	24.3%	35.7%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	1.4%	4.3%	14.3%	15.7%	40.0%	64.3%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 70

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.38
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.41 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.30

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.92

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RANK #17
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 69)

THE STUDENT WILL UNDERSTAND THAT THE FREQUENT AND PROMINENTLY PUBLICIZED CONFRONTATIONS BETWEEN THE PRESS AND ITS TRADITIONAL ADVERSARIES--THE GOVERNMENT AND THE COURTS--IS GENERALLY HEALTHY AND THAT THE FREE PRESS-FAIR TRIAL AND CREDIBILITY GAP DEBATES SHOULD REINFORCE FAITH IN GOVERNMENT, MEDIA, AND COURTS, RATHER THAN DILUTE IT.

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	2	2 %
1	0	0 %
2	4	4 %
3	4	4 %
4	19	22 %
5	15	17 %
6	26	30 %
AMBIGUOUS	7	8 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	0	0 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	8	9 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	2	0	4	4	19	15	26
PERCENTAGE	2.9%	0.0%	5.7%	5.7%	27.1%	21.4%	37.1%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	2.9%	2.9%	8.6%	14.3%	41.4%	62.9%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 70

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.39
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.40 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.33

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.93

RANK #18
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 107)

THE STUDENT WILL LIST THE RESTRICTIONS (LEGAL) AND ETHICAL) PLACED ON A JOURNALIST'S REPORTING OF THE NEWS. HE WILL EXPLAIN WHY ALL NEWS SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE PRINTED OR BROADCAST AND GIVE EXAMPLES TO SUPPORT HIS POSITION.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	1	1 %
1	1	1 %
2	5	5 %
3	4	4 %
4	20	23 %
5	25	29 %
6	24	28 %
AMBIGUOUS	2	2 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	2	2 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	1	1 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	1	1	5	4	20	25	24
PERCENTAGE	1.3%	1.3%	6.3%	5.0%	25.0%	31.3%	30.0%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	1.3%	2.5%	8.8%	13.8%	38.8%	70.0%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 80

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.45
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.36 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.17

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.72

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RANK #19
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 81)

THE STUDENT WILL LIST THE ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF EACH OF THE MAJOR MASS MEDIA--IN TERMS OF THE CONSUMER'S NEEDS AND INTERESTS. HE WILL NOTE DOMINANT ROLE (I.E., ENTERTAINMENT, INFORMATION) AND CHARACTERISTICS OF EACH MEDIUM.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	2	2 %
1	1	1 %
2	4	4 %
3	6	7 %
4	20	23 %
5	17	20 %
6	28	32 %
AMBIGUOUS	3	3 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	2	2 %
TOO COMPLEX	1	1 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	1	1 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	2	1	4	6	20	17	28
PERCENTAGE	2.6%	1.3%	5.1%	7.7%	25.6%	21.8%	35.9%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	2.6%	3.8%	9.0%	16.7%	42.3%	64.1%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 78

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.32
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.35 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.30

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.98

RANK #20
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 11)

THE STUDENT WILL ASSUME THE ROLE OF A SPECIFIC MEDIUM MANAGER AND DESCRIBE HOW HE WOULD SOLVE THE TRADITIONAL PROBLEM OF WHETHER TO PROVIDE WHAT THE AUDIENCE WANTS OR WHAT IT SHOULD HAVE. HE WILL SPECIFY HOW HE DETERMINES THE CONTENT INVOLVED IN EITHER CASE.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	1	1 %
1	0	0 %
2	5	5 %
3	4	4 %
4	20	23 %
5	21	24 %
6	23	27 %
AMBIGUOUS	4	4 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	1	1 %
TOO COMPLEX	5	5 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	1	1 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	1	0	5	4	20	21	23
PERCENTAGE	1.4%	0.0%	6.8%	5.4%	27.0%	28.4%	31.1%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	1.4%	1.4%	8.1%	13.5%	40.5%	68.9%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 74

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.42
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.33 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.20

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.77

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RANK #21
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 49)

THE STUDENT WILL EXPLAIN THE EFFECT OF RATINGS AND READER RESEARCH STUDIES ON MEDIA CONTENT DECISIONS--COMPARING THE WAYS DIFFERENT AUDIENCE MEASUREMENT AGENCIES OPERATE AND THE EXTENT OF THEIR INFLUENCE ON THE TV INDUSTRY AS OPPOSED TO THE PRINT MEDIA.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	2	2 %
1	2	2 %
2	4	4 %
3	0	0 %
4	21	24 %
5	26	32 %
6	19	22 %
AMBIGUOUS	0	0 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	8	9 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	1	1 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	2	2	4	0	21	26	19
PERCENTAGE	2.6%	2.6%	5.3%	0.0%	27.6%	34.2%	25.0%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	2.6%	5.3%	10.5%	10.5%	38.2%	75.0%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 76

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.52
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.32 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.00

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.48

RANK #22
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 43)

THE STUDENT WILL EVALUATE THE CONTENT OF THE DIFFERENT MASS MEDIA IN TERMS OF THEIR REFLECTION OF SOCIETY AND PRESENTATION OF AN ACCURATE IMAGE OF SPECIFIC GROUPS, I.E., MINORITIES, COLLEGE STUDENTS, TEACHERS, POLITICIANS. HE WILL SUPPORT HIS OPINION WITH SPECIFIC EXAMPLES.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	0	0 %
1	1	1 %
2	2	2 %
3	0	0 %
4	23	27 %
5	22	25 %
6	18	21 %
AMBIGUOUS	1	1 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	16	18 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	2	2 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	0	1	2	0	23	22	18
PERCENTAGE	0.0%	1.5%	3.0%	0.0%	34.8%	33.3%	27.3%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	0.0%	1.5%	4.5%	4.5%	39.4%	72.7%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 66

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.59
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.32 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.08

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.50

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RANK #23
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 2)

THE STUDENT WILL SUGGEST REASONS WHY A MEDIA CONSUMER MIGHT TRUST A TV NEWSCAST MORE THAN A NEWSPAPER REPORT OF THE SAME EVENT. HE WILL COMMENT ON THE VALIDITY OF THE REASONS (I.E., "SEEING IS BELIEVING").

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	0	0 %
1	0	0 %
2	3	3 %
3	3	3 %
4	23	27 %
5	26	30 %
6	19	22 %
AMBIGUOUS	3	3 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	1	1 %
TOO COMPLEX	2	2 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	5	5 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	0	0	3	3	23	26	19
PERCENTAGE	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%	4.1%	31.1%	35.1%	25.7%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%	8.1%	39.2%	74.3%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 74

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.54
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.31 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.03

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.48

RANK #24
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 1)

THE STUDENT WILL DESCRIBE AT LEAST THREE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FACE-TO-FACE COMMUNICATION AND MASS COMMUNICATION SITUATIONS. HE WILL POINT OUT THE PROBLEMS AND SOCIAL DANGERS IN MASS COMMUNICATION SITUATIONS (I.E., NO IMMEDIATE FEEDBACK, NO KNOWLEDGE OF RECEIVER, INDOCTRINATION).

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	2	2 %
1	1	1 %
2	6	7 %
3	0	0 %
4	21	24 %
5	24	28 %
6	20	23 %
AMBIGUOUS	3	3 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	2	2 %
TOO COMPLEX	2	2 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	4	4 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	2	1	6	0	21	24	20
PERCENTAGE	2.7%	1.4%	8.1%	0.0%	28.4%	32.4%	27.0%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	2.7%	4.1%	12.2%	12.2%	40.5%	73.0%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 74

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.45
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.29 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.07

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.62

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RANK #25
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 27)*

THE STUDENT WILL CONSTRUCT A PERSONAL LIST OF CRITERIA OR GUIDELINES FOR JUDGING COMPLETENESS AND ACCURACY IN MEDIA CONTENT, AND COMPARE LIST TO THOSE CONSTRUCTED BY OTHER MEMBERS OF THE CLASS.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	1	1 %
1	4	4 %
2	6	7 %
3	5	6 %
4	15	17 %
5	19	22 %
6	22	25 %
AMBIGUOUS	4	4 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	7	8 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	2	2 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	1	4	6	5	15	19	22
PERCENTAGE	1.4%	5.6%	8.3%	6.9%	20.8%	26.4%	30.6%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	1.4%	6.9%	15.3%	22.2%	43.1%	69.4%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 72

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.13
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.20 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.18

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 2.05

*AN ASTERISK INDICATES OBJECTIVE DOES NOT MEET LIMITS SET FOR Q VALUES: THUS, WHILE IT FALLS WITHIN THE ACCEPTABLE RANGE OF MEDIAN SCALE VALUES, IT FAILS TO MEET ALL CRITERIA FOR ACCEPTANCE BECAUSE OF APPARENT LACK OF AGREEMENT AMONG JUDGES. IT IS INCLUDED WITH GROUP MEETING ALL CRITERIA BECAUSE OF ITS RANK AND THE POSSIBILITY THAT EDITING OR CLARIFICATION OF THE STATEMENT MIGHT REDUCE DISAGREEMENT AND MAKE IT USABLE.

RANK #26
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 5)

THE STUDENT WILL SUPPORT OR ATTACK THE CHARGE THAT THE MAJOR IMPACT OF THE MASS MEDIA IS TO ENCOURAGE ACQUIESCENCE, PASSIVITY, AND UNIFORMITY.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	2	2 %
1	4	4 %
2	8	9 %
3	4	4 %
4	12	14 %
5	28	32 %
6	16	18 %
AMBIGUOUS	6	7 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	4	4 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	1	1 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	2	4	8	4	12	28	16
PERCENTAGE	2.7%	5.4%	10.8%	5.4%	16.2%	37.8%	21.6%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	2.7%	8.1%	18.9%	24.3%	40.5%	78.4%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 74

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.04
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.25 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 4.91

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.87

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RANK #27
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 17)

THE STUDENT WILL DEFINE CENSORSHIP AND LIST SITUATIONS HE FEELS SHOULD BE CONSORED, SPECIFYING THE AGENCY OR GROUP HE BELIEVES SHOULD HAVE AUTHORITY TO PERFORM THIS FUNCTION.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	1	1 %
1	0	0 %
2	4	4 %
3	0	0 %
4	27	31 %
5	28	32 %
6	17	20 %
AMBIGUOUS	1	1 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	1	1 %
TOO COMPLEX	4	4 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	2	2 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	1	0	4	0	27	28	17
PERCENTAGE	1.3%	0.0%	5.2%	0.0%	35.1%	36.4%	22.1%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	1.3%	1.3%	6.5%	6.5%	41.6%	77.9%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 77

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.53
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.23 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 4.92

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.39

RANK #28
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 57)

THE STUDENT WILL DISCUSS THE PROBLEMS CREATED BY THE DEMANDS FOR MEDIA ACCESS IN TERMS OF RECENT COURT INTERPRETATION OF THE FAIRNESS DOCTRINE AND THE PRACTICAL CONSIDERATION OF THE ADVERTISER (I.E., COUNTER ADVERTISING, EDITORIAL REBUTTAL).

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	1	1 %
1	1	1 %
2	5	5 %
3	4	4 %
4	19	22 %
5	30	35 %
6	13	15 %
AMBIGUOUS	3	3 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	4	4 %
NOT QUALIFIED	2	2 %
OTHER	3	3 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	1	1	5	4	19	30	13
PERCENTAGE	1.4%	1.4%	6.8%	5.5%	26.0%	41.1%	17.8%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	1.4%	2.7%	9.6%	15.1%	41.1%	82.2%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 73

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.38
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.22 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 4.82

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.44

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RANK #29
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 3)

THE STUDENT WILL EXPLAIN WHAT IS MEANT BY "CREDIBILITY GAP" AS GENERALLY DEFINED BY MEDIA PERSONNEL AND COMPARE THIS VIEW WITH THAT OFFERED BY GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	0	0 %
1	2	2 %
2	8	9 %
3	0	0 %
4	26	30 %
5	17	20 %
6	26	30 %
AMBIGUOUS	2	2 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	1	1 %
TOO COMPLEX	2	2 %
NOT QUALIFIED	0	0 %
OTHER	1	1 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	0	2	8	0	26	17	26
PERCENTAGE	0.0%	2.5%	10.1%	0.0%	32.9%	21.5%	32.9%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	0.0%	2.5%	12.7%	12.7%	45.6%	67.1%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 79

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.38
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.21 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 5.24

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.87

RANK #30
(OBJECTIVE NUMBER 108)

THE STUDENT WILL LIST AND EXPLAIN THE WAYS TELEVISION HAS AFFECTED THE CONDUCT OF POLITICAL AFFAIRS AND CAMPAIGNS. HE WILL DISCUSS THE EFFECTS IN TERMS OF THE PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF GOVERNMENT LEADERS OR CANDIDATES.

TABLE OF RESPONSES

RATING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
0	0	0 %
1	1	1 %
2	4	4 %
3	2	2 %
4	25	29 %
5	31	36 %
6	13	15 %
AMBIGUOUS	1	1 %
TOO ELEMENTARY	0	0 %
TOO COMPLEX	6	7 %
NOT QUALIFIED	1	1 %
OTHER	1	1 %

FREQUENCY OF RATING RESPONSES TABLE

CATEGORY	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
FREQUENCY	0	1	4	2	25	31	13
PERCENTAGE	0.0%	1.3%	5.3%	2.6%	32.9%	40.8%	17.1%
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE	0.0%	1.3%	6.6%	9.2%	42.1%	82.9%	100.0%

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN CATEGORY RANKING IS: 76

25TH PERCENTILE IS 3.48
50TH PERCENTILE IS 4.19 = SCALE VALUE
75TH PERCENTILE IS 4.81

Q VALUE = 75TH PERCENTILE - 25TH PERCENTILE = 1.33

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix E

Subject Experts who Participated in the Rating of Objectives

Jo-Ann Albers, The Cincinnati Enquirer
Dr. James Alexander, Cal State University Fullerton
Prof. Russell N. Baird, Ohio University
Prof. Ed Bassett, Kansas University
Prof. Lester Benz, University of Iowa
Prof. William B. Blankenburg, University of Wisconsin
Dr. Robert D. Bontrager, Kansas State University
Anne Brophy, KGO Radio, San Francisco
Susan Alice Brown, Iowa State University
Dr. William S. Caldwell, University of Southern California
Dr. Laurence R. Campbell, Florida State University
Dr. Richard F. Carter, University of Washington
Chet Casselman, Radio-Television News Directors Assoc., San Francisco
Edward Cavert, University of Nebraska
Prof. J. W. Click, Ohio State University
Prof. Robert Clyde, Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minn.
Prof. Charles O. Cole, Washington State University
Prof. Neale Copple, University of Nebraska
Prof. John W. Crawford, University of Oregon
Prof. James A. Crook, Iowa State University
Dr. Wayne A. Danielson, University of Texas
Dr. Ivan Doig, Seattle, Washington
James R. Douglas, The Boeing Company
Prof. John H. Duke, Fresno State College (California)
Prof. Alex S. Edelstein, University of Washington
Prof. James F. Evans, Philo, Illinois
Prof. Theodore P. Frederickson, Jr., University of North Dakota
Dr. J. Edward Gerald, University of Minnesota
Dean George Gerbner, University of Pennsylvania
Prof. Gene Gilmore, Urbana, Illinois
Fran Harris, WWJ Stations, Detroit, Michigan
Linda Harris, American Educational Research Assoc., Washington D.C.
Dr. Ronald G. Hicks, Louisiana State University
Prof. C. Joe Holland, University of Oklahoma
Prof. John Hulteng, University of Oregon
Dr. Louis Inglehart, Ball State University
Arnold Ismach, Edmonds, Washington
Prof. Kenneth M. Jackson, Indiana University
Prof. Harvey C. Jacobs, New Mexico State University
Dr. John Paul Jones, University of Florida
Dr. Erling Jorgenson, CCTV Michigan State University
Patrick C. Kennicott, Speech Communication Assoc., New York, N.Y.
Dr. Ernest F. Larkin, University of Oklahoma

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dr. Jae-won Lee, University of Iowa
Dr. Curtis D. MacDougall, Evanston, Illinois
Donald B. McCullough, Hughes Aircraft Co.
Prof. Delbert McGuire, Colorado State University
Prof. Susan Menne, Iowa State University
Dr. John C. Merrill, University of Missouri
Prof. William C. Metz, University of Nevada
Mike Miller, Kansas City Star
Prof. Les Moeller, University of Iowa
Colonel Joseph M. Murphy, Ogunquit, Maine
Prof. Jerome L. Nelson, Iowa State University
Harold Niven, National Association of Broadcasters, Washington D.C.
Dr. Frank Orenstein, Bureau of Advertising, New York, N.Y.
Prof. Theodore Peterson, University of Illinois
Dr. Dario Politella, University of Massachusetts
Robert Pollock, Ford Motor Co.
Prof. Mark Popovich, Ball State University
Prof. Ivan Preston, University of Wisconsin
Dr. Granville Price, Northern Illinois University
Dr. DeWitt Reddick, University of Texas
Dr. David M. Ruben, New York University
Dr. Donald Roberts, Stanford University
Prof. Merrill Samuelson, University of Washington
Arville Schaleben, Milwaukee Journal
Herb Schulte, Better Homes & Gardens Magazine
Armand A. Schwartz, Sunset Magazine
Prof. Frank Senger, Michigan State University
David Shefrin, IBM Corporation
Dr. Bernard A. Shepard, Fresno State College (California)
Margot Sherman, Senior V.P. McCann Erickson, retired, Bronxville, New York
Prof. Robert Simmons, University of Florida
LeRoy E. Smith, Buffalo Evening News
Prof. Vernon A. Stone, University of Wisconsin
Sol Taishoff, Broadcasting Magazine
Victor Ullman, Alstead, New Hampshire
Dr. Albert Walker, Northern Illinois University
Prof. John Wilhelm, Ohio University
David L. Woods, Camp Springs, Maryland

Four additional judges did not include their names.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 14 1975

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION